Special PKID Meeting: Circle G Meadows III 07-6

Wednesday, November 30, 2016

6:00p.m.

Public Works Assembly Room

Gilbert Staff: Rod Buchanan, Rocky Brown, Rick Acuna, Dave McClure

Attendees: Jerry Witt, Dan Burton, Larry Morrison, Virginia Morrison, Thyrle Stapley, Cheryl Walters, Ingrid Paulsen, Bob Crawford, Sharyn Crawford, David Wisehart, Terry Wisehart, Ann Vestal, Travis Gunnell, Steven Renniger, Pattie Beltramo, Karen Rumore, Candice Copple

Staff Contacts:

- Maintenance Rick Acuna (480)503-6268 (Office) (602)721-8345 (Cell) rick.acuna@gilbertaz.gov
- PKID Improvements Rob Giles / Dave McClure (480)503-6284 (Rob's Office) rob.giles@gilbertaz.gov (602)672-1771 (Rob's Cell)
- ➤ General Questions Rocky Brown (480)503-6330 (Office) (480)620-3593 (Cell) rocky.brown@gilbertaz.gov
- ➤ Gilbert Police Non-Emergency (480)503-6500 <u>www.gilbertaz.gov/departments/police</u>
- Website Information www.gilbertaz.gov/pkid

1. Welcome:

• Introduction of Staff

Rocky Brown, Parks and Recreation Business Manager for Parks and Recreation, was the facilitator for the meeting. Rocky introduced the staff in attendance. Rod Buchanan is the Director of Parks and Recreation for the Town of Gilbert. Dave McClure serves as a contracted Landscape Architect for PKID projects, Rick Acuna is the PKID Parks Supervisor and Rocky Brown is the Parks and Recreation Business Manager.

Welcome new attendees

Rocky welcomed any new attendees that were attending for the first time.

Overview of PKID-handout

Rocky handed out the PKID overview process for all in attendance to review.

Review of meeting process

Rocky gave an overview of the meeting process and encouraged everyone to sign in at some point before they left.

2. Review of upcoming projects for Phase 2

Staff reviewed the following items regarding Phase 2 of the upcoming project for FY17-18

- i. Review of Project Scope
 - 1. Removals
 - 2. Trees and Shrubs
 - 3. DG Material and Installation
 - 4. Irrigation

Staff reviewed the following related to the project cost

- ii. Review of Project Cost
 - 1. Basin Renovation \$65,581 (engineer's Probably Construction Cost)
- Possible changes to the project

The residents in attendance were presented with pictures of additional options for the lengthy and steep slopes in the PKID's retention area. Staff presented pictures of the following:

- Additional Plant Material
- Retaining Walls
- Fractured Rock

Through a lengthy discussion on the merits of the additional options and also the possibility of keeping turf in the area, the staff worked on consensus building for a direction and potential ballot. The group also discussed various combinations of the above to incorporate in the retention area.

There were 7 options that were written on the board, and each property owner (1 vote per property) was allowed to say which option was their preferred choice. The options with associated, estimates were:

- 1.) Turf (\$12,000)
- 2.) Rock (\$8,000)
- 3.) DG (Cost already calculated based on it was in previous plan)
- 4.) Extra plant material with DG (\$4,000)
- 5.) Retaining Walls (\$42,000) this option was eliminated due to a lack of interest
- 6.) Combination of fractured rock and DG (\$3,000)
- 7.) Combination of fractured rock, extra plant material and DG (In a different size than the picture shown)

The residents preferred a smaller fractured rock than the larger 8-12 inches pieces shown to the group and staff offered to bring out samples to their PKID for a the property owners to review.

The residents supported the options the following way:

- 1.) Turf (\$12,000) 3
- 2.) Rock (\$8,000) 0
- 3.) DG (Cost already calculated based on it was in previous plan) 0
- 4.) Extra plant material with DG (\$4,000) 1
- 5.) Retaining Walls (\$42,000)
- 6.) Combination of fractured rock and DG (\$3,000) 0
- 7.) Combination of fractured rock, extra plant material and DG 11

A resident thought that adding a \$12,000 cost estimate next to turf was biased and felt that the old irrigation system was adequate. Staff asked if the estimated number was changed to \$0, would the property owners be more likely to support it? The group finalized their votes based off that information and selections were still made according to the listing above.

• Options for multiple phases

Staff offered to do an exploratory vote of all the property owners. It will have more description with added detail for the costs. The ballot will have the three options above that garnered support in the meeting. Whatever option is the most desired, the staff will start work on. A resident continued to protest the replacement of the old irrigation system, staff explained that an assessment was completed and it was determined that it needed to be replaced. There have been issues with the system and there will continue to be issues with a system that is 25-30 years old. Technology from 25-30 years ago is not the same level of technology that today's product have.

A resident was concerned about presenting the DG cost, with the \$0 figure, since it was not the staff's recommendation. Staff offered to send out a draft ballot beforehand to let those in attendance review what would go out to all of the property owners, which everyone in attendance appreciated.

Staff asked if there was interest to do the project in 1 year or 2 years as a phasing option. Staff explained that the cost would increase by about 10%, because of additional mobilization costs. There was no direction given towards extending the project out an additional year. The estimates have this part of the project going down from the previous assessment of \$90k.

Meeting Adjourned at 7:30 pm